

# TELEGRAM

OUTGOING

SECRET

Classification

Control

Date

December 8, 1964

1 AM

SENT TO: SECSTATE WASHINGTON 2964

FINLETTER  
DUNBROG

FROM KOHLER

LIMIT DISTRIBUTION

PASS DEFENSE SECY McNAMARA

I have real sympathy for tactical problem facing Finletter and  
Norstad here vis-a-vis NAC and member Governments, and am sure their  
telegrams represent accurate estimate reactions to be anticipated to  
Rusk and McNamara presentations as presently planned. Nub of problem,  
which they correctly feel calls into question consistency, dependability,  
/19 and vigor American leadership, is to be found in ostensible conflict  
between US presentation put forward by Finletter April 26 and later  
US efforts, under instructions, put this on back on stove while pressing  
Berlin build-up. However fact that both efforts have met with  
disappointing reaction means to me that allies have in fact failed to  
face up to realities involved in real showdown with USSR and that two  
problems

SECRET

Classification

DECLASSIFIED

Authority

1MK 89-9743

By

8/10/89

NLE Date

8/10/89

REPRODUCTION FROM THIS COPY IS  
PROHIBITED UNLESS "DECLASSIFIED"

Electronic reproduction made  
by the Library for  
Preservation

# TELEGRAM

OUTGOING

Foreign Service of the  
United States of America

Charge:

~~SECRET~~ **CLASSIFIED**  
Classification

Control: 334

Date:

-2-

problems have in fact merged at this stage. Therefore believe of some importance that basic rationale for non-nuclear build-up and preferred course of action, now supported by full information on respective US-USSR nuclear strengths, be placed on table with full authority Secretaries of State and Defense. However, this must be done in non-contentious manner, without direct assault on existing political directive and (assuming this militarily warranted) with assurances reasonable conventional posture would prevent seizure of NATO territory as now anticipated by Western allies. Thus it is not enough to say (as on pages 7 and 9 McNamara draft) "non-nuclear defense in Central Europe capable at least of holding a bloc ~~in~~ conventional attack for a substantial period" "unless we can add something like "without significant incursions into NATO territory." Similarly, instead of frontal assault on "NATO political directive and NATO strategic concept" (page 10) we must make facts speak for themselves and leave to later discussions analysis and appreciation by Allies and to further/in NAC question of appropriate adjustment of existing doctrine.

EUR:FDKohler:mt  
12/7/61

GAVIN

Authorized by: Foy D. Kohler

~~SECRET~~

REPRODUCTION FROM THIS COPY IS  
PROHIBITED UNLESS "UNCLASSIFIED"  
BY THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES  
Library for  
Congressional Research Service